

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 35, indicated to be allowable, to place them in independent form.

### Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C §102.

Applicant has also amended independent claims 1, 34, and 36 to incorporate the limitation of claims 3 and 4 therein. In light of this amendment, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Gross is respectfully traversed. Gross teaches test strips holding chemically reactive substances but does not teach the use of oligonucleotides and peptides placed along the length of the fibers as now required by these claims.

moot  
light of  
new  
P.C.  
103

### Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C §103.

Stuelpnagel describes the use of oligonucleotides and peptides on coated microspheres positioned at the ends of optical fibers. Even in combination, Gross and Stuelpnagel fail to teach the use of oligonucleotides and peptides placed along the length of fiber as required by the amended claims.

There is no teaching suggestion for the modification of Gross and Stuelpnagel proposed by the Examiner. Stuelpnagel teaches away from putting reactive substances along the length of the fiber by expressly teaching that the reactions are detected using light conducted from microspheres through one end of the fiber and that the sides of the fiber are coated with wax or other registration material. There is no indication or suggestion in Gross or Stuelpnagel that the readout device of Gross intended for large paper strips and different analytic materials would work for fibers. Without the benefit of the present invention, the logical combination of Gross and Stuelpnagel would be to use individual fibers dedicated to each of the reactive substances of Gross as is expressly taught in Stuelpnagel.

Further, neither Gross nor Stuelpnagel alone or in combination teaches a library of different pre-manufactured filaments, where each filament has a number of different chemically reactive substances exposed along its surface, and a support frame allowing them to be mixed and matched as is claimed. "Kit claims" of this type have been expressly recognized as a suitable claim form. See generally, the Application of J. William Venezia, 530 F.2d 956, (1976). In contrast to the present invention, Gross contemplates multiple test strips in a frame, each providing identical tests and Stuelpnagel describes a system in which

the multiple chemically reactive substances are not grouped in premanufactured configurations in any apparent way.

In light of these amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 through 13, and 34 through 36 are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID C. SCHWARTZ

By: 

Keith M. Baxter  
Reg. No. 31,233  
Attorney for Applicant  
Quarles & Brady LLP  
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497  
(414) 277-5719

QBMKE\960296.97133\5271453.1